

Ēriks Lingeberziņš

# TŪRISMA

## UZNĒMUMA VADĪŠANA KULTŪRAS ATŠĶIRĪBU KONTEKSTĀ



**Ēriks Lingeberziņš**

# **Tūrisma uzņēmuma vadišana kultūras atšķirību kontekstā**

**Monogrāfija**



Rīga 2017

UDK 338.48

Li561

**Ēriks Lingebērziņš**, Dr.oec.

**TŪRISMA UZŅĒMUMA VADĪŠANA KULTŪRAS ATŠĶIRĪBU KONTEKSTĀ**

**Monogrāfija**

Sērija "Viesmīlības un tūrisma bibliotēka" Nr. 26

### **Recenzenti**

Dr.oec **Elvīra Zelgalve** (Latvijas Universitāte), Latvija

Dr. phil. **Annegret Goller**, Vācija

Monogrāfiju izdošanai rekomendējis Biznesa augstskolas *Turība* Biznesa tehnoloģiju institūts, Zinātniskās padomes sēdes protokols Nr. 10 (7.06.2017.).

ISBN 978-9934-543-13-5

© SIA "Biznesa augstskola *Turība*", 2017, 271 lpp.

© Lingebērziņš Ēriks, 2017

Izdevējs SIA "Biznesa augstskola *Turība*"

E-pasts: [izdevnieciba@turiba.lv](mailto:izdevnieciba@turiba.lv)

Iespiests SIA "Drukātava"

# Saturs

Darbā izmantotie saīsinājumi.....	4
Ievads .....	5
Tourism company management in the context of end consumer cultural differences .....	14
<b>1. TŪRISMA UZŅĒMUMI KĀ MŪSDIENU ORGANIZĀCIJAS UN TO VADĪŠANAS ĪPATNĪBAS .....</b>	<b>44</b>
1.1. Organizācijas jēdziens zināšanu ekonomikā.....	44
1.2. Vadīšanas funkciju un izpratnes mainība.....	58
1.3. Biznesa modelis un vadīšanas funkciju īstenošana.....	70
1.4. Tūrisma uzņēmuma vadīšanas determinanti .....	79
1.5. Globalizācijas konteksts vadīšanas funkciju mainībā.....	99
<b>2. KULTŪRAS JĒDZIENA IZPRATNE STARPTAUTISKA TŪRISMA UZŅĒMUMA VADĪŠANĀ .....</b>	<b>109</b>
2.1. Kultūras definīcija un vieta organizācija vadīšanā .....	109
2.2. Gala patērētāja kultūras atšķirības .....	119
2.3. Kultūras atšķirību strukturēšanas pieejas .....	138
<b>3. STARPTAUTISKA TŪRISMA UZŅĒMUMA VADĪŠANAS MODELIS.....</b>	<b>147</b>
3.1. Modeļa izstrādes metodoloģiskais pamatojums .....	147
3.2. Gala patērētāju apmierinātība kultūras atšķirību kontekstā.....	161
3.3. Tūristu kultūras atšķirības multi-galamērķa tūrisma uzņēmuma produktā.....	182
3.4. Tūrisma nozares profesionāļu aptaujas rezultāti .....	215
3.5. Starptautiska tūrisma uzņēmuma vadīšanas modelis globālā starpkultūru vidē .....	229
Nobeigums.....	249
References .....	253

## Darbā izmantotie saīsinājumi

ALTA	Latvijas Tūrisma Aģentu un Operatoru Asociācija
ANO	Apvienoto Nāciju Organizācija
ANOVA	Dispersiju analīze
GLOBE	Globālās līderības un organizāciju uzvedības efektivitātes modelis
IDV	G. Hofštedes kultūras dimensija “individuālisms-kolektīvisms”
IKP	Iekšzemes kopprodukts
LTO	G. Hofštedes kultūras dimensija “ilgtermiņa orientācija”
MAS	G. Hofštedes kultūras dimensija “maskulīnisms”
OECD	Ekonomiskās sadarbības un attīstības organizācija
PDI	G. Hofštedes kultūras dimensija “varas distance”
UAI	G. Hofštedes kultūras dimensija “izvairīšanās no nezināmā”
UNESCO	Apvienoto Nāciju Izglītības, zinātnes un kultūras organizācija
UNWTO	Apvienoto Nāciju Pasaules Tūrisma organizācija

## Ievads

Starptautisko tūrismu pēdējo desmitgadu laikā raksturo straujš starptautisko tūristu skaita pieaugums, jaunu tūrisma galamērķu rašanās un esošo attīstība, jaunu tūrisma produktu rašanās un starptautiskā tūrisma darījumu strauja diversifikācija. Šīs pārmaiņas ietver vispārēju tūrisma uzņēmējdarbības attīstību, tai skaitā mazo un vidējo uzņēmumu rašanos un attīstību visā pasaulē. Savukārt tūrisma pētniecību raksturo universālums – var tikt pētīta tūrisma ģeogrāfija, patērētāju un to izmaiņu socioloģija, tūrisma ekonomiskā nozīme, tūrisma uzņēmējdarbība, tūrisma uzņēmumu vadīšana un vēl citi aspekti. Dažādos tūrisma pētniecības virzienus vieno nozari raksturojošās aktualitātes – starptautisko tūristu skaita izmaiņas ar to saistītām iespējām un izaicinājumiem un uzņēmējdarbības vides izmaiņas, mainoties izpratnei par organizāciju vadīšanu.

Saskaņā ar Pasaules Tūrisma Organizācijas datiem 2015. gadā starptautisko tūristu skaits viena gada laikā sasniedza 1,184 miljardu (WTO, 2016), bet nākamo septiņu gadu laikā tas varētu pieaugt līdz 1,5 miljardiem (WTO, 2012). Tiek prognozēts, ka starptautiskā tūrisma ikgadējais pieaugums tuvākajos gados saglabāsies 3–4 % pieauguma robežās ik gadu. Tūrisma tiešā ekonomiskā nozīme 2014. gadā veidoja 2,8 % no pasaules iekšzemes kopprodukta, un tiek prognozēts, ka ikgadējais pieaugums laika posmā līdz 2022. gadam būs 4,2 % ik gadu. Kopējā tūrisma ekonomiskā nozīme (tiešā, netiešā un pastarpinātā) ir aptuveni 9,8 % no pasaules ekonomikas, un tās nākotnes pieaugums tiek prognozēts 4,3 % ik gadu, sasniedzot 11 381,9 miljardus ASV dolāru 2025. gadā. Prognozes liecina, ka 2025. gadā tūrisma nozarē būs pieejamas 130 694 000 darbavietas visā pasaulē un tūrismā būs nodarbināti 3,6 % no kopējā strādājošo skaita. Tūrisms veido 5,7 % pasaules eksporta apjoma, un 4,3 % globālo investīciju apjoms ir tieši tūrisma nozarē (WTTC, 2015). Starptautisko

tūristu skaita pieaugums raksturo pozitīvu nozares attīstības dinamiku un rada jaunas iespējas tūrisma uzņēmumu attīstībai. Tomēr līdzās statistiskam starptautisko tūristu skaita pieaugumam un ieņēmumu pieaugumam ir paredzamas dažādas izmaiņas. Tās nosaka vairāki tūrisma nozares attīstību ietekmējošie faktori, tai skaitā ar globalizāciju saistītie procesi, gala patērētājus raksturojošās izmaiņas un starptautisko tūrisma generējošo tirgu izmaiņu procesi.

Neskatoties uz to, ka tūrisma nozares attīstībai tiek pievērsta arvien lielāka uzmanība, tūrisma pētniecībā visbiežāk tiek aplūkotas tēmas par tūrisma galamērķu attīstību, tai skaitā vides un ilgtspējas aktualitātēm (*Liu, 2003; Ozzay, 2003; Page, 2007* u.c.), tūrisma plānošanas tematiku (*Collier, Dollar, 2001; Cohen, 2008; Freijers, 2011; Hall, Lew, 2009; Hall, Coles, 2008* u.c.) pakalpojumu un vietas mārketingu (*Gruning, Morschett, 2012; Freijers, 2011; Kotler 1984; Page, 2007; Pearce, et al., 2011* u.c.). Salīdzinoši retāk tiek pētīts tūrisma produkta jēdziens (*Scherle, Coles, 2008; Smith, 1994* u.c.), pakalpojumu kvalitāte tūrisma un tūristu apmierinātība (*Cronin, et al., 2000; Foster, 2009; Huang, et al., 2006; Kobylanski, 2012* u.c.). Vadībzinātnē tūrisma uzņēmējdarbībai ir pievērsta ievērojami mazāka uzmanība, un lielākā daļa vadībzinātnes pētījumu tūrisma uzņēmējdarbībā aplūko tādus jautājumus kā, piemēram, viesnīcu darba organizēšana (*Page, 2007; Old, Jones, 2006* u.c.), ilgtspējīga attīstība vai arī atsevišķu pakalpojumu sniedzēju darbības īpatnības (*Goeldner, Ritchie, 2008*). Tūrisma uzņēmumu darbība lielākoties tiek analizēta globalizācijas un pakalpojumu vai augsta nemateriālo aktīvu organizāciju darbības pētījumu ietvarā (*Reid, 2003; Reid, 2014; Scholte, 2008* u.c.). Ceļojumu aģentūru un tūrisma operatoru (tūrisma uzņēmumu) vadīšana ir maz pētīta, un biežāk ir atrodamī kontekstuāli pētījumi, kur tūrisma uzņēmumu vadīšana ir aplūkota kā viens no piemēriem, raksturojot pakalpojumu nozares uzņēmumu vadīšanu (*Nageshwar, Das, 2002*). Ņemot vērā salīdzinoši īso laika posmu, kurā tūrisma nozare kopumā ir piedzīvojusi strauju izaugsmi, tūrisma uzņēmējdarbības

vadības pētījumu trūkums ir likumsakarīgs un paver plašas iespējas tūrisma nozares pētniecībā.

Vadībzinātne aplūko tūrisma uzņēmumus kā vienu no pakalpojumu nozarēm, pētot to vadīšanas specifiku. Interesi par tūrisma uzņēmumu, tāpat kā citu pakalpojumu nozares uzņēmumu, vadīšanu saista ar vispārēju izpratnes maiņu par vadīšanas būtību, vadīšanas un vadītāja funkcijām. Paradigmas maiņa no materiālo uz nemateriālo aktīvu uzņēmumiem ir radījusi pamatu jauna veida organizāciju attīstībai, kuras raksturo atšķirīga izpratne par resursiem. Pāreja no ražošanas organizācijām uz pakalpojumu organizācijām ir viens no ievērojamākajiem procesiem, kurš būtiski ietekmējis vadīšanas kā zinātnes attīstību. Tūrisma uzņēmumu vadīšanas izpratne ir saistāma ar jauna veida organizācijām, kuru darbību raksturo augsts nemateriālo resursu īpatsvars un šo resursu aktīva izmantošana uzņēmumu ikdienas darbā. Vadībzinātnē tiek pētītas organizācijas, nevis uzņēmumi, atspoguļojot vadīšanas saturiskās izmaiņas.

Ņemot vērā organizācijas termina izpratni un izpratni par organizāciju uzņēmējdarbībā, arī tūrisma nozares uzņēmumi var tikt definēti kā tūrisma organizācijas. Tomēr saskaņā ar Latvijas Republikas *Tūrisma likuma* III nodaļu "Tūrisma pakalpojumi" ir noteikts, ka tūrisma pakalpojumus drīkst sniegt tiesību subjekts, kura darbības mērķis ir atsevišķu vai kompleksu tūrisma pakalpojumu sniegšana tūristiem, nepārprotami aplūkojot organizācijas, kuru darbība ir saistīta ar tūrisma uzņēmējdarbību. Arī tūrisma zinātniskajā literatūrā, aplūkojot tūrisma uzņēmējdarbību, tiek lietots termins *tourism enterprise* vai *tourism company* (tūrisma uzņēmums) (Hall, Coles, 2008; Halloway, 2006; Keller, 2000; Page, 2007 u.c.), jo ar tūrisma organizācijām visbiežāk tiek saprastas bezpeļņas tūrisma organizācijas, kuru mērķis ir veicināt tūrisma attīstību (Pearce, 2003, 587–588), kā arī dažādas profesionālās nozares un asociācijas. Tādēļ, analizējot zinātnisko literatūru, kurā analizēta mūsdienu organizāciju darbība



kopumā, autors atsaucas uz organizācijām, bet, raksturojot tūrisma nozares organizācijas, izmanto terminu *tūrisma uzņēmumi*.

Starptautiskā tūrisma uzņēmējdarbība ir daudzšķautņaina tēma. Saskaņā ar starptautiskā tūrisma definīciju starptautisko tūrismu veido tūristi, kuri šķērso valsts robežu un galamērķi pavada vismaz vienu nakti (*Bardolet, 2003, 323–324*), savukārt tūristu aktivitātes organizē tūrisma operatori un tūrisma vairumtirgotāji (*Evans, 2003, 584–585*). Savukārt globalizācijas un starptautiskās uzņēmējdarbības izpratne (*Daniels, et al., 2013*) paredz, ka tūrisms, tāpat kā citi uzņēmumi, attīsta savu starptautisko darbību, piedāvājot savus pakalpojumus dažādās valstīs. Līdz ar to, pētot starptautisko tūrisma vadībzinātnē, starptautiskā tūrisma uzņēmējdarbība ir pētāma gan starptautisko tūristu, gan starptautiskās uzņēmējdarbības kontekstā. Starptautiskā tūrisma uzņēmējdarbību raksturo arī vēl citi vadībzinātnes aspekti, tādi kā augsta nemateriālo aktīvu organizāciju vadīšana, pakalpojumu nozares uzņēmumu vadīšana un tūrisma nozares uzņēmumu darbību raksturojošie specifiskie aspekti. Starp tiem minama globalizācijas procesu ietekme, gala patērētāja kultūras atšķirības, galamērķa jēdziens un tūrisma produkta jēdziens. Lai raksturotu tūrisma uzņēmumu vadīšanu, veicot zinātniskās literatūras analīzi, autors secīgi aplūko šos aspektus.

Augsta nemateriālo aktīvu organizācijas un to darbības specifika ir aplūkota tādu autoru kā P. Drakera (*Drucker, 1985; 1988; 1992*), T. Stjuarta (*Stewart, 1997*), Dž. Kvinna (*Quinn, 1992*), M. Belbina (*Belbin, 2009*), T. Davenporta un V. Grūvera (*Davenport, Grover, 2001*), K. Dalkira (*Dalkir, 2011*), K. Meijera, B. Skaga, M. Joundta (*Meyer, et al., 2014*) u.c. darbos. Lai raksturotu mūsdienu organizāciju vadīšanu, visbiežāk tā tiek salīdzināta ar tradicionālu, parasti ražošanas uzņēmumu, vadīšanu. Dž. Grahams (*Graham, 1959*), Stjuarts (*Stewart, 1997*), A. Brūkinga (*Brooking, 1996*) u.c. kā galveno atšķirību izceļ organizāciju darbinieku nozīmīgumu, viņu zināšanas un prasmes. Šādas vadīšanas satvaru raksturo zināšanu ekonomika un

jaunu zināšanu apgūšana. P. Sendžī mūsdienu organizācijas raksturo – mācīšanās vai nepārtrauktu jaunu zināšanu iegūšanas konteksts. Līdz ar to mūsdienu organizāciju vadīšanas paradigmas maiņu raksturo izpratnes maiņa par resursiem un intelektuālā kapitāla jēdziena definēšana. Izmaiņas nemateriālo aktīvu organizācijas vadīšanā zinātniskajā literatūrā tiek pētītas, raksturojot pārejas no darba kapitāla uz intelektuālo kapitālu, no materiāliem aktīviem uz nemateriāliem aktīviem, no ražošanas iekārtām uz zināšanām, no saražotās produkcijas uz ārējo strukturālo kapitālu.

Tomēr tikai daži no autoriem, kuri ir plaši pētījuši mūsdienu organizācijas un to vadīšanu, ir pievērsuši uzmanību tūrisma kā mūsdienu organizāciju vadīšanai. Visbiežāk tā ir aplūkota kontekstuāli, raksturojot vadīšanas izmaiņas un pakalpojumu nozares attīstību. Kā viena no biežāk aplūkotajām jauna veida organizāciju vadīšanas īpatnībām ir organizāciju darbības virzienu daudzveidība un darbību ietekmējošo faktoru dažādošanās nozīme. Visbiežāk tā tiek aplūkota globalizācijas kontekstā. Tirgus liberalizācijas un globalizācijas procesu ietekmē tūrisma uzņēmējdarbība ir kļuvusi starptautiska un līdz ar to arī tūrisma uzņēmumu vadīšana. Vadīšanas kontekstu veido pakalpojumu nozares uzņēmumu vadīšana un ar to saistītie aspekti, gan dažādi globāli ārējās vides procesi. Par būtiskākajiem ārējās vides procesiem, kuriem ir tieša ietekme uz tūrisma uzņēmumu vadīšanu, minama starptautisko tūrisma ģenerējošo tirgu diversifikācija, kuru raksturo gala patērētāju izmaiņas un tirgus liberalizācija.

Tieši pēdējā desmitgadē, pastiprinoties globalizācijas procesiem, ir ievērojami augusi interese par starptautiskā tūrisma attīstību. Globalizāciju var uzskatīt par vienu no būtiskākajiem tūrisma attīstību noteicošajiem faktoriem, ņemot vērā tirgus liberalizācijas, tehnoloģiskās attīstības un informācijas komunikācijas attīstības nozīmi starptautiskajā tūrismā. Globalizācijas tēmu starptautiskajā tūrismā ir pētījuši dažādi autori. D. Buhalis un J. Čungs (*Buhalis, Chung, 2009*), kā arī D. Buhalis un V. Migetti (*Buhalis, Mighetti, 2010*),

pievēršot uzmanību tehnoloģiju attīstības nozīmei tūrisma uzņēmumu darbībā, N. Salazars (*Salazar, 2005; 2010*) un M. Hols un T. Kols (*Hall, Coles, 2008*), pētot tūrisma produktu attīstību un tās nozīmi tūrisma uzņēmējdarbībā, Dž. Hūkers (*Hooker, 2008*), analizējot tūrisma kā sociālu parādību, Dž. Daniels, L. Radebaugs un D. Salivans (*Daniels, et al. 2013*), pētot tūrisma starptautiskās uzņēmējdarbības kontekstā, un citi.

Globalizācija kā daudzšķautņains process ir vērtējama ļoti neviennozīmīgi. Zinātniskajā literatūrā tiek uzsvērtā tās pozitīvā ietekme uz starptautiskā tūrisma attīstību. Tomēr globalizācijas procesu rezultātā starptautiskais tūrisms nepārtraukti pielāgojas pasaulē notiekošām pārmaiņām. Tūrisma uzņēmumi un galamērķu organizācijas meklē jaunas pieejas darbā ar esošajiem starptautisko tūrisma ģenerējošajiem tirgiem, izstrādājot jaunus tūrisma produktus, atbildot uz pieprasījuma izmaiņām un attīstot jaunas pieejas, strādājot ar jauniem tirgiem, ievērojot kultūras atšķirības, patērētāju uzvedību, zināšanas un iepriekšējo ceļošanas pieredzi. Globalizācijas rezultātā tūrisma nozares uzņēmumi gala patērētāju izmaiņu skaidrojumus meklē, pētot kultūras atšķirības, lai pielāgotos tūristu uzvedībai, izprastu pieprasījumu un nodrošinātu viņu apmierinātību.

Nereti kultūras atšķirību izpratne un starpkultūru komunikācijas kompetence tiek uzskatīta par tūrisma uzņēmumu nemateriālo aktīvu, savukārt prasme to iegūt un izmantot sekmē uzņēmuma panākumus, darbojoties starptautiskā vidē. Nemateriālo aktīvu (*Adams, 2008; Adams, Oleksak, 2010; Hill, 1999; Kaplan, Norton, 2004* u.c.) jēdziens zinātniskajā literatūrā ir bieži sastopams, raksturojot mūsdienu organizācijas un to darbības īpatnības. Dažādu nozaru uzņēmumiem tie var atšķirties, tomēr tiek atzīts, ka to pārvaldīšanas prasmes ir būtisks priekšnoteikums mūsdienu organizāciju darbībā un ir viens no mūsdienu organizāciju vadīšanas vienojošajiem elementiem. Tādu uzņēmumu vadīšana, kurus raksturo augsts nemateriālo aktīvu īpatsvars, zinātniskajā literatūrā tiek pētīta, izmantojot

biznesa modeļus (*Bertels, et al., 2015; Chaterjee, 2013; Ching, Fauvel, 2013; Euchner, Gagluy, 2014; Kraajenbrink, 2015* u.c.), kā jaunu pieeju skaidrojot uzņēmumu darbības principus. Lai gan biznesa modeļa jēdziens ir salīdzinoši jauna vadībzinātnes tēma, tieši augsta nemateriālo aktīvu uzņēmumu vadīšana var tikt pētīta, izstrādājot to vadīšanas modeļus – pieņēmumus par kādas nozares uzņēmumu vadīšanu.

Galamērķis ir viens no tūrisma nozares uzņēmumu vadīšanas pamatiem. Tūrisma uzņēmumu vadīšana un galamērķa mijiedarbība ir salīdzinoši maz pētīta tēma, īpaši tūrisma uzņēmuma produkta kontekstā. Balstoties uz M. HOLA galamērķa pētījumiem tūrisma produktu kontekstā (*Hall, Lew, 2009*), var secināt, ka multi-galamērķa pētījumi ir pavisam jauns pētniecības virziens, kurš paver plašas iespējas pētīt atšķirīgu kultūru mijiedarbības nozīmi tūrisma produktu patērētāju apmierinātībā un tūrisma uzņēmuma vadīšanā, vadīšanas funkciju diskursā. Vienlaikus multi-galamērķa produkta jēdziens atspoguļo mūsdienu ceļošanas paradumus.

Grāmatai ir praktiska nozīme, jo pirmo reizi Latvijā pētītas tūrisma pakalpojumu produktu vērtēšanas sakarības kultūras atšķirību kontekstā, un pētījuma rezultāti ir izmantojami ne tikai Latvijas tūrisma uzņēmumu darbā. Grāmatā ir aplūkota kultūras atšķirību nozīme dažādu tūrisma nozares uzņēmumu darbībā, gidu un grupu vadītāju, tūrisma uzņēmuma darbinieku komunikācijā ar tūristiem un sadarbības partneriem. Tie ir izmantojami arī tirgus segmentēšanā, balstoties uz patērētāju apmierinātības pētījumā iegūtajiem datiem, ņemot vērā kultūru atšķirības. Autors ir izstrādājis praktiski izmantojamu tūrisma uzņēmuma vadīšanas modeli, lai skaidrotu tūrisma uzņēmuma darbības galvenos principus, kā arī atsevišķu pakalpojumu sniedzēju un darbinieku nozīmi uzņēmuma vērtības piedāvājuma attīstīšanai. Modeļa universālums ļauj izmantot atsevišķus tā blokus, pētot noteiktus uzņēmuma darbību raksturojošus procesus.

Grāmatas **pirmajā nodaļā** autors atklāj zināšanu nozīmi uzņēmumu vadīšanā, īpašu uzmanību pievēršot tūrisma uzņēmumiem kā augsta nemateriālo aktīvu organizācijām. Tūrisma uzņēmuma vadīšanu autors aplūko globalizācijas procesu kontekstā, pētot starptautiskās tūrisma vides izmaiņas, kuras nosaka nepieciešamību meklēt jaunus tūrisma uzņēmuma vadīšanas modeļus. Kā būtisku vadīšanas izmaiņas noteicošu komponenti autors identificē kultūras atšķirību nozīmi tūrisma produkta veidošanā un pārdošanā un starpkultūru komunikāciju tūrisma uzņēmuma vadīšanā. Pētot intelektuālā kapitāla un zināšanu nozīmi, autors pievērš uzmanību arī zināšanu pārvaldībai un zināšanu darbiniekiem, kā augsta nemateriālo aktīvu organizāciju veidojošiem elementiem.

**Otrajā nodaļā** autors aplūko kultūras jēdzienu kultūras un uzņēmējdarbības vadības mijiedarbības kontekstā. Šajā nodaļā autors skaidro kultūras atšķirību būtību un kultūras atšķirības kā īpašas zināšanas, kuras izmantojamas uzņēmējdarbībā. Pastiprināta uzmanība pievērsta kultūru un to atšķirību strukturēšanas modeļiem un starpkultūru komunikācijai. Tiek skaidroti esošie kultūru atšķirību sistematizēšanas principi un vērtēta to nozīme un izmantošanas iespējas tūrisma uzņēmumu vadīšanā.

**Trešajā nodaļā** ir atspoguļoti kvantitatīvā pētījuma rezultāti, tos interpretējot izmantojot G. Hofštedes kultūras dimensijas, veicot korelāciju analīzi un klasteru analīzi. Autors analizē tūrisma nozares pārstāvju aptaujas rezultātus, pamatojot modeļa izstrādes lietderību, un raksturo aktuālās starptautiska tūrisma uzņēmuma vadīšanas tendences. Interpretējot pētījumā iegūtos datus, autors izstrādā starptautiska tūrisma uzņēmuma vadīšanas modeli un raksturo modelī attēlotos uzņēmuma darbības principus.

Monogrāfija būs noderīga tūrisma un viesmīlības nozares studiju kursu docētājiem un studējošajiem. Autora izstrādātais modelis viegli izmantojams, skaidrojot tūrisma uzņēmumu darbības principus, un tas ļauj sekot tūrisma uzņēmumu produktu izstrādes gaitai,

atgriezeniskās saites veidošanai ar gala patērētāju un piegādātāju atiecību veidošanai. Vienlaikus pētījuma rezultāti un izstrādātais modelis būs noderīgs tūrisma un viesmīlības nozares uzņēmējiem, īstenojot darbinieku apmācību. Monogrāfijā autors skaidro katra atsevišķa pakalpojuma sniedzēja lomu gala patērētāja apmierinātības nodrošināšanā, un izstrādātais modelis izmantojams, pilnveidojot darbinieku izpratni par patērētāju apmierinātību tūrisma un viesmīlības nozares uzņēmumos.

## **Tourism company management in the context of end consumer cultural differences**

Several past decades in the context of international tourism can be described by fast increase of international tourist arrivals, emergence of new tourist destinations, development of existing destinations, development of new tourism products and diversification of tourism transactions. These changes include overall development of tourism entrepreneurship, including emergence of small and medium size tourism companies around the world. In its turn, tourism research is characterized by universalism – can be explored tourism geography, consumers and the behavioural sociology change, tourism economic impact, tourism entrepreneurship, tourism company management and several further aspects. Different tourism research directions are united by topicalities of the industry – changes related to the number of international tourist arrivals and related opportunities and threats, caused by these changes, as well as business environment changes, under circumstances of the changing organization management understanding.

In spite of the fact that tourism industry related research is gaining popularity, most often tourism research concentrates on such topics as destination development, including environmental and sustainability issues (Liu, 2003; Ozzay, 2003; Page, 2007 et al.), tourism planning (Collier, Dollar, 2001; Cohen, 2008; Freijers, 2011; Hall, Lew, 2009; Hall, Coles, 2008; et al.), service industry and tourism place marketing (Gruning, Morschett, 2012; Freijers, 2011; Kotler 1984; Page, 2007; Pearce, Filep, Ross, 2011; et al). Comparably less attention is dedicated to the understanding of tourism product (Scherle, Coles, 2008; Smith, 1994; et al.), service quality in tourism and tourist satisfaction (Cronin, et al., 2000; Foster, 2009; Giese, Cote, 2000, Huang, et al., 2006; Kobylanski, 2012; et al.). Management

science dedicates even less attention to tourism entrepreneurship and most often management research in tourism entrepreneurship explores such issues as, for example, hotel operations management (Page, 2007; Old, Jones, 2006; et.al.), sustainable development or only peculiarities of specific service providers (Goeldner, Ritchie, 2008). Generally, tourism entrepreneurship is explored within the frame of globalization and service or high intangible asset organization operation context (Reid, 2003; Reid, 2014; Scholte, 2008; et.al.). Management of travel agencies and tourism operators (or tourism companies) has been little researched and usually those are contextual researches, where tourism company management is examined as one of the examples, describing service company management. (Nageshwar, Das, 2002). Taking into consideration comparably little period of time, within which industry has experienced fast growth, lack of tourism entrepreneurship research is natural and this situation provides wide opportunities in tourism industry research.

Management science examines tourism companies as one of the service industry companies, exploring the management specifics. Similarly to other service industry companies, tourism company management is associated to general change of the understanding of the essence of management, management and manager functions. Paradigm change from tangible to intangible asset organizations has secured ground for development of new type of organizations, where main differences are embedded in different understanding about resources. Transition from tangible asset production organizations towards service organizations is among main processes which have significantly influenced the development of management as a science.

Taking into consideration the understanding definition of organization and understanding of the definition of organization in entrepreneurship also tourism industry companies can be defined as tourism organizations. However, according to the Chapter III "Tourism services" of the tourism law of the Republic of Latvia it is said that



tourism services can be provided by holders of the right which aims to provide independent or complex tourism services to tourists, without any doubt, analyses organizations providing activities related to tourism entrepreneurship. Therefore, analysing scientific literature which is dedicated to activities of contemporary organizations, author refers to organizations, while analysing tourism industry organizations, uses term *tourism companies*.

International tourism entrepreneurship is a complex subject. According to the definition of the international tourism, international tourism consist of tourists which cross state border and spends in the destination at least one overnight (Bardolet, 2003, 323–324), while tourist activities are organized by tourism operators and tourism whole sellers (Evans, 2003, 584–585). However, the understanding of globalization and international entrepreneurship (Daniels, Radebaught, Sullivan, 2013) foresees that tourism, same as other companies develop their international activities, offering their services in different countries. Therefore researching international tourism within the frame of management science, international tourism entrepreneurship can be analysed both in the context of international tourists, as well as in the context of international entrepreneurship. International entrepreneurship is described also by further aspects of the management science, such as high intangible asset organization management, management of service industry companies and specific aspects exploring tourism company management. Among them should be mentioned the importance of globalization processes, end consumer cultural differences, the understanding of tourism destination and tourism product. To analyse the management of tourism companies, author sequentially analyses these aspects.

Book is composed by three chapters, where first and second chapter is dedicated to analysis of scientific literature about company management, the understanding of culture and cultural differences and third chapter discloses author's performed empirical research results and is provided author's developed business model essence.

In Chapter 1 the author analyses scientific literature on management of organisations. The role of knowledge in company management has been researched, paying particular attention to tourism companies as organisations of high non-material asset proportion. The author addresses management of tourism companies in the context of globalisation processes, researching changes in the tourism environment establishing the necessity of searching for new models of tourism company management. The author identifies the role of cultural differences in forming a tourism product and its sales and the role of inter-cultural communication in tourism company management as a substantial change-determining component. Researching the importance of intellectual capital and knowledge, the author also pays attention to knowledge management and knowledge staff as contributing elements to high non-material asset proportion organisations. Taking into account the goal of this research, the notion of a business model, the main stages of its formation are addressed and alternative business model development methods analysed in scientific literature, are assessed.

The role of knowledge in securing company competitiveness serves as basis not only for knowledge management (Davenport, Prusak, 1998; O'Dell, Hubert, 2011), but also for knowledge based company theories (Grant, 1996). The task of knowledge management is to promote growth of information and knowledge as well as to create of value by means of a systemic effort (O' Dell, Hubert, 2011, 2). Taking into account the actual owners of knowledge – humans, T. Davenport and V. Prusak point out that at the age of global economy knowledge can be the strongest competitive advantage of a company (Davenport, Prusak, 1998, 13). According to the authors, knowledge advantage is simultaneously also a sustainability advantage (Davenport, Prusak, 1998, 17).

Identifying knowledge as a resource of a company in the late 1980-ies, the beginning of 1990-ies saw the development of a

completely new approach when addressing organisations – “knowledge based company theory”. In 1990 P. Senge (Senge, 2006, 4), defining the preconditions for an existence of a successful company, defines a learning organisation.

In 1991, while characterising economy, I. Nonaka addresses the growing global uncertainty, stressing that “the only certainty is uncertainty; the only safe sustainable source of competitive advantage is knowledge”. With markets changing, technologies developing, competition increases and products may become dated overnight, therefore successful companies are those, which permanently produce knowledge and swiftly introduce it in new technologies and products. (Nonaka, 1991, 96)

With the increasing role of knowledge in a company, knowledge of individual staff members and their management has reached a new level of significance, where individual knowledge become knowledge of an organisation as a whole and where the top executive level embraces management of organisation and its knowledge (Nemeck, Kocmanova, 2011, 572). K. Dalkir points to four main identifiable factors determining the necessity for implementing knowledge management in operations of an organisation (Dalkir, 2011, 22–23): globalisation and comprehensive trend of organisations becoming global; there is a permanent necessity to do more and to achieve it faster; workforce, by becoming increasingly mobile, creates challenges to the continuity of organisational knowledge and it defines the necessity for permanently attracting new knowledge staff to an organisation; technological facilities determine the necessity for a continuous approachability and fast reaction time.

M. Adams, using the intellectual structure model of L. Edvinsson and M. Malone (Edvinsson, Leif, 1997), structures knowledge, which is the main resource, in three ways according to the manner they are comprised in an organisation (Adams, 2008, 191–192; Adams, Oleksak, 2010): **human capital** (Bontis, et.al., 2000, 87), **structural**

**capital** (Nezam, Ataffar, et al., 2013; Bontis, et al., 2000, 88), **relationship capital** (Bontis, et al., 2000, 87), external networking in capital and branding. K.Cabello and T.Kekale in their own turn base their approach to defining intellectual capital on the social and human capital of an organisation, moreover, where the social capital is based on a structure (networking) and relationships (quality of relations) (Cabello, Kekale, 2007). Human resource capital is particularly important in organisations with a high proportion of non-material assets – staff, which is in a permanent process of learning and accumulation of knowledge and whose productivity directly depends on the knowledge they possess (Nishikawa, 2011, 115).

When looking at scientific literature, the author basis his approach on M. Witzel's management transformation dimension, looking at the tree main approaches of interpreting the fluctuation of understanding of management and the change of contents. When researching the origins of management and its historical development and addressing management changes, M. Witzel points to the key dimension of change, first of all, singling out: the development of information and communication technologies; secondly, on the global economic growth and integration; thirdly, on the discussion on access to resources, their utilisation and long-term planning of their use (Witzel, 2012, 220). Examining the works of V. Bennis (Bennis, 1978), M. Witzel (Witzel, 2012), Ch. Savage (Savage, 1996) and other authors, the author concludes that the main management changes are directly linked with new types of knowledge required by organisations. Addressing the differences between traditional and contemporary organisations characterised by a high importance of intellectual capital, it is possible to identify differences, characterised by the change in management functions in contemporary organisations.

The author concludes that management contents and operations of a contemporary organisation are affected by both: **knowledge as a resource of an organisation** and non-material assets, which

form **the intellectual capital**. Moreover, specific knowledge and contents of intellectual capital of each industry being different, organisation, characterised by a high proportion of non-material assets, operates under conditions affected by a particular industry. In technical sciences, where the notion of model has been addressed more often, it is defined as an interpretation of theory (Kuhne, 2005), a function of interpretation (Weiss, D'Mello, 1997), a representative miniature, which explains the ways a company operates (Magretta, 2002). Most often a business model is understood as business architecture, design, pattern, method, assumption or assertion (Morris, et al., 2005, 726), with a help of which value proposition, economic activity, cooperation partner network, internal activities, target markets, sources of income and products are addressed (Morris, et al., 2005, 727). In its essence, a business model is more of a conceptual model than a financial one, defining the ways an organisation creates and delivers value to consumers, and its basis is formed by market segmentation and value proposition creation for each segment (Teece, 2010).

A. Osterwalder and Y. Pigneur have developed the most comprehensive and currently the most utilised business model canvas (Euchner, Gangluy, 2014) with a help of which the business models created assist to grasp, visualise, understand, communicate and share the business logic of a company (Osterwalder, Pigneur, Tucci, 2005, 7). The basis of business model development is formed by 9 key modules, subordinated to the main goal of business models – creation of value supply of goods or services offered by a company. The 9 modules are mutually interrelated, thus encompassing the business model development system as a whole (MaRS, 2012; Osterwalder, Pigneur, 2009, 44). The defined modules are: client segments, value proposition, communication channels, client relations, income flows, key resources, main activities (ensuring functioning of a created

model), key partnerships 9 with suppliers, cost structure (Osterwalder, Pigeneur, 2009).

Since tourism companies are ones of the most visible and developed services industry businesses, their management is characterised by the general principles of management applicable to the service industry, essentially expressed by a non-transfer of ownership. Interest in managing of service industry companies has resulted and developed simultaneously with interest in marketing of services. The service industry is characterised by its “vision of simultaneity of production and consumption” (Blois, 1083, 254). From the late 1970-ies onwards with the increasing demand for various types of services, a rapid growth of establishing service industry companies has been observed. Establishment of such companies raised questions regarding the specifics of managing service industry companies.

Income from international tourism and the dynamics in the numbers of international tourists is persistently positive (UNWTO 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2015, 2016), reflecting the international growth of tourism. This development changes the ways tourism companies are managed, envisaging implementation of management functions beyond national borders (Certo, 2003, 98; Mead, Andrews, 2011). The key differences in managing an international company determine the necessity for specific knowledge and can be subdivided as: business environment related knowledge, cultural differences and their impact on business environment, competition environment (Business Encyclopedia, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed.).

International development of tourism companies is directly linked with the increasing impact of globalisation characterised by a changing global situation, whereas companies have to operate under increasingly complicated circumstances. Development of companies is characterised by uncertainty and ambiguity presupposing that former systems and routines are no longer valid (Gerg, Trinczek, 2008, 144). Researching the role of knowledge in a tourism company,

L. Beesley and C. Cooper point to an important aspect: with the existence of highly intense global competition and in order to retain their market positions, tourism destinations are required to be innovative. Knowledge acquisition, sharing and utilisation in their day-to-day operations, is a substantial precondition for successful accomplishment of the task (Beesley, Cooper, 2008).

K. Halloway, characterising the fundamental principles of tourism industry, points to its two key forming elements – a tourist and a tourism product. The complicated nature of a tourism product is characterised by the inability of customers to inspect it prior to making a purchase (Halloway, 2006, 8). P. Kotler defines product as anything that can be offered to the attention of the market, purchase, use, consumption in order to satisfy a certain wish or necessity (Kotler, 1984, 463).

In order to define a tourism product M. Hall and A Lew view it by means of defining a service and its utilisation. “Services are non-material, it is the experience and even if a person has a chance to keep memorabilia in the form of a souvenir or photographs, the service primarily creates experience. Experience can be accumulated only in a person's mind” (Hall, Lew, 2009).

In the context of this research, the author, when addressing a **tourism product**, makes a reference to a tourism business product (Hall, 2009), understanding it as a product created by a tourism company, which is available at a certain destination. In order to characterise a tourism product, created by using several destinations simultaneously, it is defined as a **multi-destination tourism product**.

Consequently, the specific character of a tourism product determines the peculiarities and risks of managing a tourism company that a tourism company may face in quality assessment and formation of feedback with a company. End-consumer (tourist) satisfaction with a tourism product, together with joy, complaints, education and skill development, is an outcome of tourist behaviour, understanding and studying of which offers a possibility to elaborate tourist

experience while at a destination (Page, 2007). With an increasing competition in all areas, organisations are pushed to seek opportunities of offering their clients improved services for lower prices. Client allegiance, satisfaction and loyalty are preconditions for profitability of a company in contemporary conditions (Duman, Kozak, 2009, 145).

From the beginning with 1990-ies there is a tendency of increase in conducting consumer satisfaction surveys, which can be explained by a comprehensive worldwide development of tourism. Tourism consumer satisfaction surveys mostly deal with various consumer differences, striving at explaining their origins. Researching consumer satisfaction in tourism, D. Chadee and J. Mattson point to the necessity of addressing the variables simultaneously, thus obtaining a more comprehensive insight in consumer satisfaction, when receiving a tourism product (Chadee, Mattsson, 1996). It is particularly culture, based on its diversity, which in the early stages of market and marketing development was considered as one of the most complicated tasks facing managers (Hawkins, et al., 1089, 52).

Taking into account the changes in management characterised by a shift in the understanding on resources, the global integration and the role of information technologies, as described by M. Witzel (Witzel, 2012), as well as the role of macroeconomic forces in developing a business model as identified by A. Osterwalder and Y. Pigneur (Osterwalder, Pigneur, 2013), as well as the non-material nature of knowledge and intellectual capital and understanding of globalisation framework – all have substantial importance in studying the changeability of contemporary organisation management. Globalisation has stimulated global integration and its manifestations are clearly visible in international tourism affecting management of tourism companies (Dunning, 2014; Ghiurco, 2014). Systematic research reveals that globalisation is characterised by its main aspects, often referred to as globalisation dimensions or discourses (Sae, 2005).



They reflect combined models of analysis of globalisation and the processes created by it: **political, economic, technological and social**.

The author comes to a conclusion that globalisation as a comprehensive process involving economic, political, technological and social changes, substantiates a necessity to define international tourism companies – companies, which offer their product in two or more countries. Since a tourism company, as a service industry company, does not necessarily require making of direct investments in production resources in order to commence operations in another country, including opening of an office, the notion of a multinational company cannot be applied to tourism companies, which prepare their product on the basis of a cooperation agreement with suppliers (separate service providers) (Hill, Jones, 2014; Kogut, 2001; Mead, Andrews, 2011). Therefore, the author uses a term international tourism company and in the proposal section, based on the scientific literature review, suggests to supplement *Tourism and Hospitality Explanatory Dictionary* with a subsequent term *international tourism company* – a unified body of material and non-material elements, which is designed to perform business activities in two or several countries.

In **Chapter 2** the author addresses the notion of culture in the context of interaction between culture and business management. In this chapter the author, when analysing scientific literature, explains the essence of cultural differences and cultural differences as special knowledge, applicable in business.

R. Frey defines values as acquired, relatively tolerable, emotionally charged and morally represented generalisations, which facilitate making of judgement and prepare for action (Frey, 1997, 19). Analysing the role of knowledge in a contemporary organisation, T. Davenport and L. Prusak pay particular attention to effective knowledge transfer, which takes place in an organisation on a continuous basis, regardless of the will of a manager (Davenport, Prusak, 1988, 88).

Based on a paradigm envisaging the existence for a role of culture in a company and in social interaction processes, there exist different understandings of an approach to researching this process of interaction. One can identify several approaches in literature, dealing with cultural interaction. Based on research produced by I. Reisinger (Reisinger, 2009), V. Gudykunst (Gudykunst, 2002, 2003), P. Olson (Olson, 2010), M. Lustig and J. Koester (Lustig, Koester, 2012), J. Neuliep (Neuliep, 2006) and other authors of cultural interaction models, a separate interaction is viewed when addressing different manifestations in a different culture; communication as an interaction between representatives of different cultures; management of cultural differences as a separate form of business including marketing of services; inter-cultural communication as a business element, addressing it from a negotiation perspective, as a communication tool in international environment for the purposes of reaching the goals of an organisation.

In distinction from traditional organisations, communication of a knowledge-based organisation is characterised by its prevalence at various levels of an organisation and practically all employees of an organisation perform communication related tasks (Denning, 2011, 152). P. McDougal and B. Oviatt define international business as an innovative, proactive, risk-challenging action, which spreads across borders and is aimed at creating value within organisations (McDougal, Oviatt, 2000, 903). Its operations are characterised by the necessity of understanding the tastes and choices of customers, which differ depending on customer's country history and culture (Hill, et.al., 2004, 268).

In the context of tourism, inter-cultural communication is observed when a tourist meets a host from an unfamiliar culture and in guest-host relations when a host meets tourists from an unknown culture (Reisinger, 2009, 167). As a result of this meeting, the host tries to understand the wishes of the tourist in order to offer products that

he/she desires, while the tourist communicates his/her wishes to the host in order to obtain the product desired. In this light, several stages of inter-cultural interaction can be identified in international tourism, which exist between different tourism companies and an end-consumer.

Systematisation of cultures is a precondition for performing further assessment of the significance of culture and its use in interdisciplinary research. G.Hofstede stresses the fact that, by means of culture, individuals and society determine the borders of their daily routine, creating such categories, as the good or the bad, the right or the wrong, and others (Hofstede, 1989). The work performed by G.Hofstede in systematising culture has served as a substantial precondition for facilitating understanding of the formation processes of the global business environment and communication space.

Research has been done in 4 following stages. **1<sup>st</sup> stage:** defining of research problem statement definition, **2<sup>nd</sup> stage** development of research design, **3<sup>rd</sup> stage:** research sample and data obtaining method evaluation, assessment, analysis and interpretation, **4<sup>th</sup> stage:** development of a tourism company management model, using A. Ostervalder's and Y. Pigneur's (Ostervalder, Pigneur, 2009) Business Model Canvas and approbation (Nykiel, 2007; Veal, 1997; Hair, et al., 2003, Clark, et al., 1998).

Research has **quantitative approach** as it aims to describe a **model** of management of an international tourism company as a phenomenon which is based on the understanding of **cultural differences** which is defined by tourist **attitude** towards a multi-destination tourism product. Author, referring to scientific literature review, defines research problem: the management of an international tourism company is dependent on tourism product assessment and tourist satisfaction which is influenced by the specifics of tourist culture.

Research plan predicted use of scientific method in preparation of research plan (Hair, et al., 2003, 54). Research was carried out

during four tourism summer seasons during months from May to September. In spite of the fact that survey was performed during consecutive four summer season data have been analysed together, therefore excluding longitudinality in research. Primary data has been gathered using traditional approach – visitor survey (Veal, 2011, 274).

Overall, 2640 valid questionnaires were received reflecting 28,5 % of total number of distributed questionnaires which is sufficiently reliable amount to have reliable samples.

Sample distribution corresponds to actual tourist distribution and sufficiently large samples have been achieved ( $n \geq 50$ ) (Kristapsonė, Kamerāde u.c. 2011). Non probability sampling composition method has been used on form samples (Kumar, 2005, 174). Questionnaire questions were consisting of 5 blocks – regarding information guest received from travel agency, hotel services assessment (Callan, 1995, 1997, 1998), tour leader and local guide work performance assessment (Moscardo, 1996; Pond, 1993; Tilden 1957; Rabotic, 2010), traditional dinners at city restaurants and excursions and questions about transportation – transfers from and to airports and transportation services during trip (Barrows, Powers, 2009).

In order to assess internal consistency and data reliability (Field, 2009), Cronbach's Alpha coefficient was calculated: 0.971. Data analysis, primary, was performed summarizing all acquired data for different service product evaluating them in different destinations. Data analysis has been performed using IBM SPSS 22 data processing program.

To perform correlation analysis, author performed Kolmogorov-Smirnov test which allowed to identify that end consumer survey data distribution corresponds to normal, therefore, further research requires using of parametric statistical methods and correlation analysis is based on Pearson  $r$  correlation coefficient calculations (Field, 2009).

Additionally, performing cluster analysis, author's analyses principles of grouping of different end consumers, originating from different countries, considering different destinations. Cluster analysis has been performed using hierarchical agglomerative analysis that presumes that originally all objects (different country tourist samples) each is an independent cluster and uniting them emerges a cluster (Hair, et al., 2003).

Aim of the second part of the research is to explore the attitude of tourism company representatives on conclusions achieved from the scientific literature analysis on international tourism company management.

Survey was performed from June 19<sup>th</sup>, 2015 to July 9<sup>th</sup>, 2015. To complete research non probability sampling has been used and justification of research method selection is based on research problem definition and a model of management of an international tourism company as a phenomenon (Kumar, 2005).

Based on these criteria, 202 potential respondents were selected whom were sent electronic questionnaires. During research period 118 valid questionnaires were received. Questionnaire is composed on 45 questions, where 27 are attitudinal scale. To assess internal consistency of the questionnaire, author calculated questionnaire's Cronbach Alpha : 754, confirming data validity.

In the conclusion of a model of an international tourism company management was presented at a focus group discussion. It took place on November 12<sup>th</sup>, 2015 and was organized with 9 members, whose knowledge and practical experience in tourism allows discussing about developed model.

To analyse results author used concept map, which allows to follow discussion and receive answers on issues interesting to author and is the most optimal solution for focus group discussion analysis (Nagle, Williams).

Preparing research plan author planned several research stages using quantitative and qualitative research methods. However, concluding research stage includes developed model approbation – assessing it using focus group discussion.

**Chapter 3** reflects the results of a quantitative study, interpreting them by using the cultural dimensions of G. Hofstede, performing correlation and cluster analysis. The author analysis the poll results of tourism industry representatives, substantiating the effectiveness of developing this model and characterises the topical tendencies in international tourism company management. By interpreting the data obtained as a result of the study, the author produces a model of international tourism company management and describes the principles of company operation reflected in the model.

The research was conducted by using survey data obtained in 6 tourism destinations – Vilnius, Riga, Tallinn, Helsinki, St. Petersburg and Moscow. Taking into account the condition that each of these destinations has to be located in different countries, each of them has to be considered as a unique variable, therefore before researching a multi-destination product, involving these destinations, and comparative arithmetic mean value analysis of services was performed.

When producing correlation analysis, the author concludes that despite a close connection between the majority of destinations, several substantial differences between service assessments in the destinations could be observed and the author researches further 3 groups of destinations – 1) Helsinki, St. Petersburg, Vilnius, Riga and Tallinn, 2) Vilnius, Riga and Tallinn, and 3) Moscow and St. Petersburg (See table 19). Despite the fact that the correlation quotient of observations between Helsinki and Vilnius is lower in comparison with other destinations within the group, this correlation, when substantiating viability of such a group, can be considered as sufficiently close (Hair, et al., 2003).

The average assessments of all groups (excursions, group leaders and guides, transport and hotels) have been used as the basis for further research, which involved correlation analysis, first of all, for all groups together and, secondly, separately for each of the countries involved, taking into account the destination (Helsinki, Moscow, St. Petersburg, Riga, Tallinn, Vilnius). This analysis serves as the basis for developing an international tourism company management model.

The author produced correlation analysis of the information received of the average service assessment received with the arithmetic mean value of the overall service assessment for the purposes of establishing the existence of any patterns or regularities between them or lack of them. Analysing the results, the author concludes that generally in all cases addresses the information compliance assessment has been higher in comparison with an overall assessment of a particular service.

In its own turn, addressing the compliance assessment of the programme received and the arithmetic mean value of the product assessment, the author gained a similar comparison to the assessment of information compliance with the service product quality assessment – although information received and conformity of the product received has been assessed comparatively highly, the quality of separate services has been assessed at a lower degree. Despite a seeming difference between the overall arithmetic mean value of service assessment and conformity of the information received at the moment of buying and the actual assessment of a service received, as well as assessment of conformity of the service received, the outcomes are insignificantly positive or insignificantly negative,  $r=0.050$  and  $r=-0.121$ , respectively (see Table 5).

In order to characterise the results of the research, arithmetic mean values of combined service assessment at all destinations have been addressed, reflecting the average arithmetic mean value assessments in a non-statistical way. The necessity for such a summary

is substantiated with a need for a more complete assessment of cultural differences and the role of destinations and the statistical closeness of their correlation, by performing correlation and cluster analysis. At the same time, the overview of research results provides an impression on differences in perception and service habits between tourists of different countries. These observations are applicable when researching general habits of tourists and they provide an idea on separate critical issues in the context of a tourism company product. The following summary reflects the structure of tourist questionnaire – 4 sets of questions, including the ones regarding excursions and restaurants, the work of guides and group leaders, transport services and hotels with sub-questions for each of the sets.

The results acquired reflect the existence of cultural differences in assessing services. Therefore, the author believes that they have a significant impact on the operations of international tourism companies, which manifests itself in preparation of tourism company products, in forming relations with its clients and in implementing cooperation models with their suppliers.

In order to assess the significance of cultural differences of end-consumers in satisfaction assessments of tourism company service products, the author analysed primary data obtained in the framework of this research by performing data correlation with the five cultural dimensions of G. Hofstede. Indicators used in the description of cultures were obtained as a result of correlation and mathematically expressed assessments of dimensions. Therefore, there is an opportunity to use them when seeking correlations with various researchable indications (Basabe, Ros, 2005; Hofstede, 2011). As part of the research, the author performed 11 correlations of the average arithmetic service product assessments at 6 destinations with five cultural dimension indicators of G. Hofstede with end-consumer selections representing 12 countries, which have been studied as part of the author's research.



First of all, comparative analysis of information conformity and assessment of service received was made by utilising the indicators of cultural dimensions by G. Hofstede. They show that small, but definitive correlations (Hair, et al., 2003) can be observed between information conformity assessment and LTO dimension and PDI dimension, as well as a small, but definitive correlation between PDI dimension and conformity of the service received. Average, as well as small, but definitive negative correlations between UAI dimension and assessments of all services point to the fact that selections of tourists from the countries characterised by a lower UAI indicator are characterised by higher arithmetic assessments of services, leading to a conclusion that selections of tourists from those countries are more flexible in judging the services, they are more open to differences as expressed by their attitudes in terms of expectations from a service and their actually received service.

Performing of correlation of 6 destinations and 12 selection groups with five cultural dimensions of G. Hofstede, 4 sets of questions produced 6 average and 9 small, but definitive correlations (Hair, et.al., 2003). The author considers the small, but definitive correlations ( $\pm.21$ – $\pm.40$ ) as indicative, providing an opportunity to judge on the existence of correlation between average arithmetic assessments and cultural dimensions, whereas the average correlations ( $\pm.41$ – $\pm.70$ ) point to certain regularities and utilisation opportunities of results.

Since only separate correlations between service assessments of tourism from varies countries have been established and the indicators of cultural dimensions by G. Hofstede, direct use of these correlations in developing a management model of an international tourism company can only be used in parts.

The results obtained confirm the role of cultural differences in assessing service products, and the results can be utilised in planning of operations of an international tourism company, providing

characterisation of attitudes of various consumers towards various services and point out the tendencies of assessing services. Jointly with the conducted average arithmetic comparative analysis, the results gained provide an opportunity to comprehend habits of separate tourists in the process of assessing services.

However, the most significant gain achieved by performing correlation analysis is constituted by observations characterising the differences of destinations in assessments made in various cultures. For the purposes of identifying regularities, which are not based in direct coherences between cultural dimension of G.Hofstede and service assessments, but rather taking into account the framework of the study – 6 destinations and research selections, during the second stage of research the author performed cluster analysis.

Cluster analysis “identifies individuals or groups of objects, which are similar to each other, but different in comparison to individuals in other groups” (Norusis, 2011, 361; Hair, et.al., 2003, 370–371). Drawing a conclusion that the correlation analysis of the cultural dimensions of G.Hofstede and the average assessment of services provides an imperfect notion of cultural differences and their significance, and for the purposes of obtaining more accurate data, the author has applied cluster analysis. Cluster analysis, forming similar groups, creates a notion of similar and different practices of tourists in service assessments. Ward method has been applied in the cluster analysis (Norusis, 2011, 373), utilising IBM SPSS 22.0 data processing software.

The following conclusions were drawn as a result of the analysis – tourists of all 12 selection countries belong to several clusters, however some clusters need to be singled out:

- the cluster of Australia, Switzerland and the USA, characterised by lower arithmetic mean information conformity and programme conformity assessments;

- the separate clusters formed by the UK and Germany, which provide grounds to conclude that according to information conformity and programme conformity the UK tourist selection, based on its allegiance with several clusters, can be treated as a benchmark selection. A similar characteristic is also applicable to the tourist selection of Germany.

Similar observations are obtained by performing cluster analysis, viewing of destinations within the three destination groups pre-defined by the author, leading to a conclusion that, as part of the research, information conformity and in assessments of services received, a destination does not affect the principles of cluster formation.

The results of cluster analysis lead to a conclusion that:

- comparing the make-up of all destination group clusters, the author has observed that assessments made by tourist selections of European countries largely fall into one cluster, while tourist selections from such countries as Australia, Brazil, the USA, Argentine are placed in a different cluster;
- in hotel assessments, reflected in the overall assessment of hotels and in location and room assessments, the selection of Swiss tourists, based on a larger number of observations, can be placed in one cluster with tourist selections from non-European countries. A similar characteristic is also applicable to the tourist selection of the UK;
- in hotel catering service assessments, another principle of cluster formation is comparatively more vivid, where one cluster is formed by tourist selections from Brazil, Argentine and the USA, while the second largest cluster is formed by European tourist selections, and differences between the two clusters can be observed in different destination groups;

- comparing the assessment clusters of hotel catering services, the author draws a conclusion that they are not comparable and that the assessments made by Italian tourist selections for hotel catering services have a general tendency of being similar to the assessment of tourist selections from other countries, as opposed to city restaurant assessments, while the assessments of catering services made by tourist selections from Belgium and the Netherlands differ regarding both: hotel catering services and city restaurant services. Tourist selections from Argentine and Brazil, in their turn, fall into one cluster regarding all categories of catering services.

Since, as part of quantitative research, the author applies selections formed by end-consumers (tourists) of a tourism company product, in order to confirm the conclusions drawn in the overview of scientific literature on the peculiarities of managing an international tourism company, as well as to study the views of tourism industry professionals on the possibilities for developing an international tourism company management model encompassing, *inter alia*, an interaction of a tourism company with a chosen destination and company partnership with its clients and indirectly – with tourists and suppliers as providers of separate services, the author has performed a quantitative survey of tourism industry professionals.

Out of 118 tourism industry representatives surveyed, 80.5 % represent tour operators, 13.6 % – travel agencies, 4.2 % – online travel agencies and 1.7 % – operate as agents working from home. However, 38 % of tour operators indicate travel agency activities as the secondary profile of activities of their companies, and likewise, the respondents of travel agencies have indicated tour operator profile as their secondary line of business activities. For 52.5 % of respondents outgoing tourism is their main line of activity, while for

47.5 % it is incoming tourism. The selection is composed of medium sized (<50 employees), small sized (<50 employees) and micro-companies (<10 employees), 52.3 % of selected respondents represent medium or small sized tourism companies, 84.7 % of them are located in Europe and 15.3 % elsewhere, and they offer multi-destination products at destinations as defined for the purposes of the research.

The author draws a conclusion that responding to the needs of clients and tourists is accepted as one of the key preconditions in tourism company operations, moreover – there are no differences in this assessment between tour operator and travel agencies. However, the attitude of tour operators towards the needs of tourists cannot be evaluated in an unambiguous way, considering that 18.6 % of respondents have agreed to a statement that tour operators pay insufficient attention to the needs of tourists and 31.4 % have expressed a neutral reaction to it.

Developing of feedback with clients and tourists should be considered an equally important task.

This means that management of a tourism company should be viewed as a system constitution a continuous process and involving preparation of company supply by interacting with suppliers (providers of separate service products), clients and end-consumers and by continuously developing company offer.

The needs and forming of feedback is subordinated to segmentation, considering the culture-based differences among tourists reflected in the overall assessment of company services and offer. A majority of respondents acknowledge segmentation as being widespread in the tourism industry (only 3.3 % of the respondents according to the survey completely disagree or partially disagree with this claim) – this claim is completely or partially supported by 62.7 % of respondents.

51.7 % of respondent completely or partially disagree with a claim that cultural differences are not important in assessing service

quality, while 26.3 % completely or partially support it. A minimal negative correlation  $r=-0,02651$  exists between the assessments of this claim and the assessment of the degree of prevalence of segmentation, thus substantiating the role of cultural differences as a possible approach in client segmentation in tourism.

Cooperation with suppliers and clients is estimated highly and 45.7 % of respondents fully and partially agree with a claim that a personal contact with suppliers can compensate a higher service price, while 72.1 % of respondents surveyed fully or partially agree with a claim that a personal contact with clients is equal in importance with the price of a service and 84.7 % of respondents fully or partially agree with a claim that a joint development of a product (in cooperation with suppliers) can improve competitiveness of a company. Only 1.7 % of respondents partially disagree with this claim. 72.9 % of respondents fully or partially agree that in outstanding circumstances they can reach goals of hiring suppliers through a higher level management and only 6.7 % disagree with this claim partially or in full.

The author comes to a conclusion that a model of international tourism company management based on cultural differences is a tourism company business system, envisaging successful intercultural communication with all parties involved in developing, sales and management of a company product, thus facilitating company operations in a global inter-cultural environment. The system is formed by the capacity of an organisation to utilise cultural differences as knowledge targeted at facilitating company operations, cooperation with suppliers and partners. The basis of the system is formed by understanding of the importance end-consumer cultural differences.

The model is formed by knowledge on the importance of cultural differences in assessing service products. This knowledge characterises capital of an organisation with a high proportion of non-material resources as well as skills in utilising it in a number of ways:

- in communication with cooperation partners of a tourism company for the purposes of multi-destination product sales. Taking into account behaviour and satisfaction with the services received determined by cultural differences, a company has an opportunity to form relationship and social capital with its cooperation partners. Therefore, a tourism company is capable of providing two-way communication with its cooperation partners and promote customer satisfaction with the services received;
- in cooperation with tourism product service providers at different destinations; by working with a multi-destination product, a tourism company has a possibility to diversify its cooperation models with service providers at different destinations on the basis of its knowledge on end-consumer preferences;
- in communication and transfer of knowledge on cultural differences to personnel and service providers of an organisation, including to tour guides and group leaders. In order to make a more successful use of the knowledge on cultural differences for the purposes of reaching company goals and ensuring its operations in an inter-cultural environment, a common understanding of cultural differences, their importance in ensuring customer satisfaction and in behaviour is of utmost importance. An international tourism company requires a system, which would facilitate dissemination of this information to its personnel, its indirect personnel (e.g., guides working with tourists) and to service providers;
- taking into account the role of cultural differences in the context of the theme and goal of this research, utilisation of knowledge on cultural differences is possible by using it in ensuring the key management functions of a company.

In order to summarise conclusions produced at different stages of this research (end-consumer satisfaction with a tourism product, dimensions by G. Hofstede and end-consumer satisfaction correlation results, end-consumer cluster analysis and the survey of industry professionals), the author by applying the business model canvas worked out by A. Osterwalder and Y. Pigneur, is developing an international tourism company management model. As viewed before, the author uses 9 modules of the model, simultaneously taking into account J. Kraaijenbrink's criticism substantiating the adaptation possibility of this tool.

Developing an international tourism company management model taking into consideration the role of end-consumer (tourist) cultural differences as concluded in the research made by the author and by utilising the tool of Osterwalder and Pigneur, the author believes that the basis of this model is formed by 5 key components as its integral parts:

Firstly, client relations, client segments and channels cannot be separated and viewed in a unified way. Secondly, it is end-consumer and culture characterising this user. Thirdly, knowledge of clients representing different cultures, their satisfaction with an overall tourism product and service products forming it, builds non-material assets of a tourism company. Fourthly, a tourism company product as the main tourism company asset, which is offered by a company to its clients, is one of the key parts constituting a value proposition of an international tourism company. Fifthly, an international tourism company management model should include a place – destination where a tourism company offers its product.

The basis of this model is formed by the 9 business modules of Osterwalder and Pigneur, where 3 modules (client relations, client segments and channels) are substituted with client segments based on cultural differences. Taking into account the conclusions drawn from the research on client satisfaction, the author singles out 3 client



segmentation modules, which are united by inter-cultural communication in the development of tourism company product as an explanatory segment. The basis of the model developed is formed by modules marked with a red, dashed line. They are supplemented with modules marked in yellow, which are supplemented by the author. Operation of the model is marked with yellow arrows. The yellow, straight lines depict the main conclusions of the research work, while the yellow, dashed arrows point to secondary conclusions of research. The modules in black have been added by the author to the developed business model. They have been added on the basis of conclusions drawn, while reflecting the limitations of this research.

The business model canvas is supplemented with conclusions obtained by the author while working with the scientific literature and on this research, and the 4 defined components of international tourism company management, including end-consumer culture (and its differences), knowledge (as a non-material asset), place of tourism – destination, a tourism product. In the developed international tourism company management model, based on cultural differences, the author reflects several principles of tourism company management.

Firstly, end-consumers and their characteristic cultural differences can be utilised when forming client segments based on cultural differences. These segments are characterised by the differences in service product satisfaction assessments, which should be classified when producing client clusters in line with what was performed in the course of the research work. Simultaneously, understanding of these differences and client segments form knowledge used by a tourism company in developing its product. At this stage company has an opportunity to assess a necessity for product differentiation and its degree. An in-depth assessment of differentiation can provide an idea on expected cost and price of a product. In order to implement and utilise a model based on end-consumer cultural differences, knowledge is obtained not only from end-consumers

themselves, but also from company clients, in their partnership and activities. Therefore, in order to utilise cultural differences and their impact on satisfaction with a tourism product and separate services in the best way possible, acquisition of knowledge is a two-fold process where a tourism company interacts with end-consumers and with its clients.

Secondly, taking into consideration tourism as an asset of a high non-material proportion, the model reflects a system by means of which an international tourism company gains and utilises cultural differences as knowledge, forming its intellectual capital. Intellectual capital is a part of international tourism company value proposition, formed by knowledge of end-consumer satisfaction, inter-cultural communication skills and a tourism company product. A tourism company product is one of the key parts constituting international tourism company management. However a tourism product creates a tourism company value proposition, if it interrelates with key partnerships and is formed in cooperation with separate service providers.

Thirdly, value proposition is at the centre, it is created by a tourism company offering its product and destination – a place of tourism, where a product is being offered. In fact, value proposition cannot exist if a tourism company ignores a destination. In its own turn, inter-cultural communication in this process ensures a correct perception of a tourism company product and also of a destination. With the existing imperfections in inter-cultural communication, a tourism company value proposition can be interpreted as being inconsistent with an intention of a tourism company. Communications skills in an inter-cultural environment produce a value proposition, which is transferred to both – a destination and a tourism company product.

Fourthly, a place of tourism – destination is a substantial part of a tourism company value proposition, since, as reflected by the results of research made by the author, the same service product is

perceived differently at different destinations. The author concludes that tourism companies, whose product is offered at different destinations, require developing target product strategies, which should ensure a possibly higher degree of consumer satisfaction. In practical terms a place of tourism as a destination cannot exist separately from companies, which offer their tourism products at the respective destination. Therefore, competitiveness of a destination is linked not only with available destination resources, but also with non-material assets – knowledge resources of tourism companies operating at a certain destination. Moreover, a destination can also act an obstacle to tourism company operations and to the development of a tourism company product, attributable to the key activities of a tourism company.

Fifthly, combined knowledge of end-use cultural differences and their fluidity at different destinations can be utilised in forming partnerships with tourism company clients. This way an international tourism company can offer higher value to its products.

Sixthly, a value proposition of an international tourism company lies in a product, its presentation which is manifested by utilisation of its key resources. Utilisation of resources forms at least 3 types of capital, which altogether form international capital value of an organisation. Client segmentation as well as separate service providers, affects 3 modules of capital. The 3 types of capital directly affect partnerships in both directions.

Participants of the focus group discussion pointed out that the developed model provides a clear notion and system of utilisation of cultural differences when working with tourists from different cultures, and those cultural differences had to be considered as important knowledge allowing to understand issues essential to an end-consumer. This knowledge is substantial to tourism companies, facilitating improved identification of adequate ways of presenting the contents of a company product to tourists of different countries. Participants of the focus group admitted that merging of client segments,

client relations and channels on the basis of a degree of understanding of cultural differences is substantiated when responding to characteristic traits of consumers representing different cultures.

By conducting research of scientific literature and a practical study of end-consumer cultural differences as well as by developing and performing approbation of international tourism company management model, the author drew a number of conclusions. They can be viewed in the context operation of the developed model and it simultaneously refers to such research aspects as management of a contemporary organisation of a high proportion of non-material assets, end-consumer satisfaction, cooperation and company cooperation with clients and suppliers.